

REMARKS:

I. Introduction

In the Office Action mailed on March 11, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1 to 15 and 17 to 20 and objected to claim 16. The present amendment cancels claim 16, amends claims 1, 17, 18, and 20, and adds no new claims. Accordingly, claims 1 to 15 and 17 to 20 remain pending in this application.

II. Claim Rejections Based on 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1 to 3, 12, and 13 under 35. U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Batliwalla (US 4,777,351).

Independent claim 1 and claims dependent therefrom are allowable because they each now include the limitation of previous dependent claim 16. Note that the Examiner indicated the subject matter of dependent claim 16 to be allowable if rewritten into independent form. No prior art of record reasonably discloses or suggests the present invention as currently defined by independent claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

III. Claim Rejections Based on 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

(a) The Examiner rejected claims 4 to 10 and 17 to 20 under 35. U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Batliwalla (US 4,777,351) in view of Higgins (5,270,519).

Claims 4 to 10 are allowable as depending from allowable claim 1 as discussed above and independently allowable for novel and nonobvious matter contained therein.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Independent claims 17 and 18 and claims dependent therefrom are allowable because they each now include the limitation of previous dependent claim 16. Note that the Examiner indicated the subject matter of dependent claim 16 to be allowable if rewritten into independent form. No prior art of record reasonably discloses or suggests the present invention as currently defined by independent claims 17 and 18. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

(b) The Examiner rejected claims 11, 14 and 15 under 35. U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Batliwalla (US 4,777,351) in view of MacCracken et al. (5,632,919).

Claims 11, 14, and 15 are allowable as depending from allowable claim 1 as discussed above and independently allowable for novel and nonobvious matter contained therein. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

IV. ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner objected to claim 16 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but indicated it would be allowable if rewritten into independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 16 depended from independent claim 1 and there were no intervening claims. The subject matter of dependent claim has been inserted into independent claim 1. The allowance of claim 1 is requested.

V. CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is found that the present amendment does not place the application in a condition for allowance, Applicant's undersigned attorney requests that the Examiner initiate a telephone interview to expedite prosecution of the application.

If there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-2326.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard M. Mescher
Reg. No. 38,242

PORTER, WRIGHT, MORRIS & ARTHUR LLP
41 South High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215
(614) 227-2026
Fax: (614) 227-2100

June 10, 2005

Re. Application Number 10/733,748

Page 8 of 8 pages